Previous references.

M. 73192 — 1897-98 190 .

(Forest.)

File No. 86 0691 9 :

Serial Nos. 1- 8

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1- 8

Major **~~Part~~ B. for** August 03.

SUBJECT.

Correspondence with regard to Compensation to certain Inam lands in Kandahalli village.

Sl.1. From the D.C. Bangalore.

No: D.1347. 13.4.98.

Reports that the tope Survey No: 13 for the planting of which Inam land was granted in Mudabal village Magadey Taluq, was sold in 1886 and the sale cannot be set aside.

Sl.2. To — do —

No: 10179 25.4.98.

71.7.155-95

Invites attention to his letter No: 745 dated the 11th October 9 to the address of the Conservator of Forests.

Sl.3. G. R. S. 58 From - do —

No: D.944. 14.12.00.

States that the report called for in re - the tope included in the Savanadurga State Forest has been forwarded to the Conservator of Forests with No: 1059 of [redacted] instant.

No. 254/49 [illegible]

Submits records re certain land in the Kandahalli Village, Madabal Hobli of the Magadi Taluq required for Savandurga State Forest.

KRS. From the C.F. & To the Conservator

No. ____ 14.12.[illegible]

Forwards a copy of docket No. [illegible] dt. 25th April 98 from the Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore Gen. & Rev. Secretariat

To the D.C. Bangalore.

No. [illegible] 11.6.01

Calls for an account of the responsibility of different officers who settled the Compensation for the godi lands of Kandahalli in the Magadi Taluq

From Do.

No. W 1805. 23.5.01

Submits report on the subject of the settlement of compensation for the godi lands of Kandahalli in the Magadi Taluq taken up for the Savandurga State forest.

To Do.

No. 94/1090 12.6.01

Directs that the godi owners may be called to explain why he should not refund the compensation paid to their wrongful misrepresentation.

M. S. Krishnaraja

For orders

Memo

Jodi lands taken up for the Savendurga State ~~Forest~~ in the Magady Taluk.

No 105 15-6 / R. 1108 92-1-94

H 7. 31 0892-93

82

In sanctioning a compensation of Rs. 500/- for the acquisition of the Bechirakh Jodi Village of Kandahalli situated in the middle of Savendurga State Forest in the Magady Taluk, Government presumed ~~Looked~~, that the ~~Forest~~ of Forests had ~~Dept~~ Insp. Genl. ~~shall~~ satisfied himself that the village had been enfranchised and that the person who had given the Mutchalika was competent to sell the ~~Village~~ land.

Mr Ricketts thereupon found that the Village had not been enfranchised

being a Dharmadaya Inam & promised to submit a further report in due course.

× No 119-G 11 / 94.
16

Letter No. 1549 of 24/10/94.
139

2. The Conservator of Forests now submits certain correspondence from which it would appear that the Tope and the land granted for its maintenance, which form a Dharmadaya grant ~~and they~~ might be resumed to Govt the Tope being treated as Govt property: that the Jodidar has consented to receive Rs 500/ as compensation for the land and Tope, plus 100 Rs for loss of crop, that the Jodi on the land was written off in 1891 92 — the accounts and that the Jodidar has ceased to pay the Jodi from that year.

The

~~Collector for consideration~~

~~Proceedings recorded~~

– Jodi land in question was granted for the upkeep of the Tope planted by the Inamdar and not both the

3. The Conservator adds that the compensation of Rs 500/- fixed for the Jodi land already included in the Savenduega State Forest might be paid from the provision in the Current year's Forest Budget, the additional sum of Rs 100/- now claimed by the Jodidar for loss of crops being treated as a consideration for the Tope proposed to be resumed to Government, and paid from Land Revenue, to which the usufruct of the Tope goes if any.

4. There appears to be no objection to the acquisition of the (Shanmadaega) Jodi land referred to and to the payment to the Jodidar, of the compensation fixed therefor, in-as-much as

the acquisition is in the
interests of Government &
the Jodidar who has consented
to surrender the Dope, escapes
from the obligation of
preserving the minimum
number of trees thereon.
But the question is whether
the Revenue Department
can reasonably be expected
to pay for the Dope which
is intended to be required
for the convenience of the
Forest Department & made
over to it, and which being
a charitable one, has yet nothing
in return. Unless the Revenue
Department is prepared to
alter the charitable nature
of the Dope and convert it
into a Government one,
which is also doubtful, the
additional sum of Rs 100/-
claimed by the Jodidar
for loss of crops, has to be
debited to the Forest Deptt.
Submitted for orders.
H B
11/11/96.

№ 4883

3

5

5.

Subd Dist Ct.

The Plff is an unnaturalized Dane, there is nothing to prevent him from acquiring his naturalization papers. The Defendant cannot be compelled to put up with an incompetent. Until the date of payment, the Defendant is entitled to the use of crop.

Both the items may stand and the Plff allowed to file a proper charge on the Forest Record - & may be sanctioned accordingly

12-11-96

12/11/96

Defendants

13/11/96 CS

Subd with Draft

CS 13/11/96

6. In sanctioning the com- [illegible] (10)
-pensation of Rs 600, as directed
in the preceding para, it was
directed that the lapse should
be transferred to the Revenue
Department to be treated as other
Govt charitable Inam (No 4590-77
GI 4 158-95)

7. With reference to the above [illegible] (11)
the Dy Commr of Bangalore (Urban)
to notice that the lapse in question
was sold to one Ramanjappa
Rs 75 and the sale was confirmed
by the then Asst Commr.
Mr Abdul Rahiman issued orders
that the sale should be cancelled.

8. These facts are now said
have come to light subsequent
to the issue of Govt order referred
to in para 6 supra. From
the Dy Commr's letter it would
appear that when Inam land
was granted for the planting
of the lapse on the Kandayam
land or assessment of the
land on which the lapse trees
stands was not written off.
the planter probably thinking

that by raising the question of assessment he would be deprived of the use of the produce of the tope. Possession having since changed hands the Inam lands was purchased by Thippanna while the tope stood in the name of the heirs of the original planter and was sold, as said above, for arrears of revenue. The question would have been better settled had these facts been brought to notice in the first instance. This Communication ought to have been submitted through the Conservator.

Revenue
Subd for orders with a draft.

22/4/98 22/4/98

Cont'd

9. With reference to the above the Dy. Commr. was asked to submit a report through the Conservator as to how the mandar had consented to make

over the Tope in question
to Govt as per Mr Elliah the
executed by him in [illegible]
When the tope had passed
into the hands of one Rama
in 1886 and whether the whole
or any portion of the Compensation
of Rs 600 had already been paid
and if so to whom.

10. (As directed above the
Dy. Comm. submits his report
which is to the same effect as
abstracted in paras 7 & 8 supra.
S. No 42 of Kandahalli was in 1862
granted as Jodi for planting
and maintaining a Tope in
Kodihalli (S. No 13). In 1881
the Jodi land was sold in
auction for arrears of revenue
and it was purchased by one
Chanbagua VenKatramiah.
From this VenKatramiah
Karnik Thippiah subsequently
purchased it. But the patta
still remains in the name of
the Inamdar's heir (Krishnappa)
a brother of Thippiah adopted
into the family. The Jodi
land was acquired for the
Sawendurga State Forest in 1872. When
the jodi amount was struck off the accounts.

(1 (1st (11))

Letter No 1059 dy 14.12.00

13 The Compensation of Rp 500 proposed by the Forest Deptt. was for the Jodi land of Kandahalli and for the tree growth thereon. This was taken over for the Savendurg forest. The additional sum of Rp 100 was as compensation for the loss of crops in the Jodi land from the date it was taken to the forest (1892) to the date of payment of Compensation (1898). The whole amount (600) was debited to the Forest budget. It would be wrong to pay any compensation for a charitable topa over which the inamdar had no claim & who was supposed to enjoy a separate inam land for maintaining the topa. The inam land itself having been purchased by Thippiah he may not have been aware of the existence of the topa which had passed into the hands of Rama in 1886. Moreover the topa being

Sl. Nos. (1) and (2) and Ex. 5 of Ver: Records.

Ex. J of Ver. Records

Sl. No. (9/a)

(10)

situated in another Village (Kodihalli)
the Forest Depart had
no need to acquire it for
the Savendurga Forest. There
appears to be much ability
and misapprehension in the
whole transaction.

14. The present reference has
simply to be recorded with
any observation which the
Govt may consider desirable.

To Save further tearing of papers
as the Veri: papers are with Stricken.
25/3/01

15 Who is responsible
(1) for not reporting the
real facts of the case
to the Dy C of Forests
& Govt in the first
instance. (2) for [illegible]
a clear title from the
Jagirdar in respect of
the lots which had long
been cleared by
encroachment & for
reduction in the area of

9

Court no 745 of the
11th October 96 solicit
ed both the Conservator
& the Govt to believe
that for the reasons
his question Govt was
urging [illegible]
[illegible] both the
Jodi land & the lope
have been reputed owners
of land the vote was
[illegible] by
the Govt [illegible]
land) to be used by
the Quandar with
[illegible] to be used with
the Govt [illegible]
lope / Vidi Govt no
W.P. 4570-72
D/ 19/11/96

The Jodias had
no saleable interest
in the lope. [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

(3) for urging the
-Revenue to the Jodias
in June 99 when the
question of his title to
the lope was [illegible] of the
Commissioner of his
Muchalkas were
under correspondence
when in Court Govt
had in calling for
a further report

Northern of the room -
- Mrs Lan had been
Next to whom -
& for the Lay delay
of 2 years & 6 months
in making the Disposition
which I did in Dec 1900 -
(a complete information
as to the Lunacy of Mrs
Caroline Elizabeth
Blanch Wyndham
with Mrs Lan's Evidence to
16. 2.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy
Council will be moved for
a Petition for
a Judicial Writ directed to
the Archbishop of Canterbury
which will have the effect of
staying proceedings in the
Consistory Court of London
& the Bishop of London -
Mrs Caroline Elizabeth Wyndham
will be
said to have been Lunatic
& of unsound mind
& incapable of managing
her affairs
from the 1st day of December
1900 to the 31st day of
December 1901 -
I must ask you to
& what I have to say
on behalf of the Petitioner

Subscribe draft
CN 7/4/01

17. The observations contained in preceding paras 15 and 16 were communicated to the Dy. Commr Bangalore District in Order No. 611 / 9.62 155-95 dated the 11th April 1901; After several reminders and two intermediate replies he now reports that the Amildar, Mr Devanadachar, who was the Amildar of the Magadi Taluk in 1896 and who took a Muchalika from Krishnamurti Rao is now retired and the Dy. Commr Mr B.K. Venkatavaradaiyar who ordered the payment of the Compensation and the Dy. Commr Mr V. N. Narasimiar who made the recommendation to the Conservator are not now in the District; and that the Jodidar Krishnamurti Rao says that the Compensation amount was paid to him for whatever title he possessed in the land and that at this distant date he protests against the re-opening of the question. It would appear that out of the Compensation amount the amount of Kandayam due for previous

Sl. No. (18)

Letter No 1305-9 23.5-03.

† Vide Sl. 6 above.

Sent 8/8/03

(13)

REVENUE — Gl. No. 7467 H. 4181
R 4423
1897-98 818-4-98

From

The Dy. Commissioner, of the
Bangalore District.

SECTION Forest
FILE No. 86 of 97-98
SERIAL No. 1

To The Secretary to the Govt.
of Mysore
Genl & Rev Departments.

Dated 13th
Despatched 14th } April 1898.
Received

General No.
No. 1347.

Enclosure No.

H. 7. 31. 892-93
H. 7. 31 M
81 W. 6.

Govt Pro: No 4570-72
H. 7. 155-95
of the 19th November 1896.

Reports that the Block in Survey No. 13 for the planting of which, Inam land was granted in Madabal village, Magadi Taluk, was sold in 1886 and the sale cannot now be set aside —

Rev
16/4/98

Note Cancd & Subd with a draft
of
21/4/98

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore the 2nd June 1898.

D No 1347.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue and General
Departments

Sir,

With reference to
Government Proceedings No 1050-70
M.D. 5-98
dated the 9th November 1896, Sanc-
tioning a certain compensation for
an Inam land in the Kadabal
village of the Nagamangala Taluk and
directing that the case for which the
Inam was originally granted should
be investigated and the matter reported
by the Revenue Department, I have
the honor to State as follows.

2. In 1853 a certain land
bearing Survey No 12 in the Kadabal
village of the Nagamangala Taluk
was granted to one Linganagappa
as Inam for planting a tope in

Survey No 13, a Kandayan land of his own, in the Kodiballi village of the same Taluk. It appears that the assessment on the land on which the Cope was planted was not written off the accounts, as should have been done according to circular No 15 dated the 28th July 1846.

Page 195 of the Revenue Manual

3. The planter of the Cope does not seem to have applied for the reduction of this land from his Khata. Probably he was enjoying the Cope as his private property and taking the produce and did not care to praise the question of the remission of the assessment lest he should be obliged to keep the Cope open to the public and be deprived

This is contrary to Rule 8 of the Rules in force in the Province as per page 196 of the Revenue Manual

the use of the produce

4 After the death of Narasingappa, the original planter the lands passed to his grandson Krishnappa. In 1881 Krishnappa's Inam land No 42 in the Hadabal village was sold for arrears of land revenue and was bought by one Shanbogue Venkatarayanappa of the Shanbendurnalli village. But the patta of the land has till now remained in Krishnappa's name. Venkatanarayanappa states that he bought the land at the auction sale and that subsequently he sold it to one Lingappa ~~[illegible]~~ brother of Krishnappa but adopted into another family.

5. 5th. In 1886 on account of arrears of land revenue due from Krishnappa Certain lands of his were sold by auction. Among these was the Tope, Survey No 13 in the Hodikatti village. This was bought by one Rama for Rs 25/- and the sale was confirmed by the then Sub Division Officer Mr. Abdul Rahiman (Vide Sub Division officer's order No 1029 dated the 25th February 1886.

6 On inquiry Subsequent to the issue of the Government Proceedings under reference, the above facts were brought to light.

7. Under the circumstances I have come to the conclusion that the Sale of the 'Tope' in

Revenue 17

1898

14

From

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To The Dy Commr
Bangalore Distt.

SECTION - Forest
FILE No. 86 of 1897-98
SERIAL No. 2

Dated 25th April 1898.
Despatched 25
Received ✓
General No. 10179
X-F. No. 155-95
Enclosure No.

His letter No. 1347 dated the 13th April 1898, regarding the tope included in the Savandurga State Forest in the village of Julukal.

With reference to the above has the honor to the Dy Comr's
invite attention to his letter No. 7115 dated the 11th Oct. 97 (Para 4)
to the Conservator of Forests wherein it was stated that the Inamdar had consented to make over the tope to you as per Muchalika executed by him on 26th August 1896.

If, as stated in the above letter, ~~Krishnamurthi Rao was not in possession of the tope which was sold to him in 1886 but the same continued to be in the enjoyment of his own & Govt Muchalika Rights over the property & they did not possess and they did not exercise his possession & they Rights~~

The tope had passed into the hands of one Rama in 1886 & Krishnamurthi Rao had leased it to the Inspn Dept which now

275 — 9

~~189~~ 1900-01.

From

The Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

(15)

To The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore
Rev. & Agrl Dept.

Dated 14th
Despatched 15th } December 1900.
Received

General No.
D No. 944.

Enclosure No. Nil

SECTION Forest
FILE No. 86 of 1897-98
SERIAL No. 3

Secretary's docket
No. 10179 dated 25th April 1898.
F.F. 155-95

States that the report called for in re the tope included in the Savendurga State Forest has been forwarded to the Conservator of Forests with No. 1059 of the 14th Instt.

Conservator's Report.

R
17.12.00
Subd. The Conservator's report can be awaited at 23/12/00

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore the [illegible] 190[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

[illegible]

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

356 //

~~189~~ 1901.

(17)

FROM

The Conservator of Forests
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Govt
Forest Department

Dated 1st February 1901.

Despatched

Received

General No. 2541
No. 49

Enclosure No. 1 bale

SECTION Forest

FILE No. 86 of 1897-98

SER'AL No. 4

Submits records regard-
-ing certain land in the
Kandikalli village, Madabal
Hobli of the Nagadi taluq,
acquired for Sarendrug
State Forest.

Subd with note in Contrt
CS
25/3/01.

Office of the Conservator of Forests
in Mysore,

No: 2541/49 Encs: 1 file

Dated, Bangalore, 31st January 1901.
1st February

From,

The Conservator of Forests in Mysore.

To,

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore,
Forest department.

Sir,

In submitting herewith the records regarding certain land in the Kandikalli village, Madabal Hobli of the Magadi taluk, acquired for the Savendrug State Forest and referred to in General Secretary's No: + 10179 F-7. 155-95 to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore, I have the honour to submit the following remarks.

+ Sl. No. (14) in Sec. II

2. In 1862, land bearing Survey No: 42 in the Kandikalli village, measuring about 86 and odd acres, and assessed at Rs 26-3-4 was

Vide date

granted as inam to one Narasingappa for the purpose of planting and maintaining a tope in Survey No: 13, unalienated land of his own situated in a separate village viz, Kodihalli. The assessment of Survey No: 13, instead of being written off the accounts was regularly paid by Narasingappa and this irregularity was not noticed by the revenue authorities.

3. On the death of Narasingappah the lands passed on to his grandson Krishnappa and in 1881, on account of arrears of land revenue due from the latter, his inam land Survey No: 42 was sold by auction. His land was bought by one Subbatramaiah Shanbhogue, and subsequently sold by him to Appaiah brother of Krishnappah but omitted

into a separate family. This change is not noted in the village accounts and Krishnappa's name alone appears in the Khata.

4. In 1886, on account of arrears of revenue due from Krishnappa Survey No: 13 (the tope) was also sold by auction and one Rama purchased it. Even at this stage the Revenue authorities do not appear to have instituted proper enquiries as to the nature of the land in question or as to the use made of it by Narasingappa and his heirs and confirmed the sale.

5. In 1892 the late Inspector General of Forests recommended Government to acquire the inam land, Survey No 42, which was situated within the proposed limits of the Savendurg State Forest, on payment

of compensation amounting to
Rs 500/-; and Government in their
Proceedings No. 10515-6 dated 2nd
January 1894 recorded sanction
to the same on the presumption
that the Inam was enfranchised.
Subsequently the Collector ascertained
from the Inam Superintendent
that the Inam being "Dharma-
-kartru" was not subject to en-
-franchisement. Thereupon it was
thought advisable to give other lands
in lieu of the Inam land instead
of money compensation but as this
was not found feasible, money com-
-pensation was decided upon.
In the meanwhile, the Inamdar
brought to notice that his Inam
land had been taken up by the
Forest department and prayed for
an additional compensation

of Rs 100. This was also sanctioned

Sl no. (11) in Sec II in Government Proceedings no: 4570-72 dated 19th November 1896 with the observation that the tope should be relinquished by the godidar and transferred to the Revenue Depart-ment which would deal with it like other Government charitable topes.

6. On further enquiry as to who was the lawful claimant to the com-pensation the deputy commissioner found that the inam land had reverted to Government since the grantee had not fulfilled the terms of the grant. Moreover it was brought to light that Survey no: 13, which ought to have been treated as Government property, ever since the Inamdar's failure to fulfil the terms of the inam, was in the —

unlawful enjoyment of Krishnaffa
and land only was transferred
in 1886 to the name of the purchaser
Lingu, who, the Deputy Commissioner
says cannot at this distance of
time be dispossessed. It is, however,
clear that this lease which is said to
contain only 55 trees at present
is not within the State Forest

7. Although it would apparently
have been easily ascertained that
Appaji and his son Krishnamurthi
had no valid title to the land in
dispute taken up by the Forest depart-
-ment in 1892 and for which the
above mentioned confirmation
had been given up the Deputy
Commissioner ordered payment
of the confirmation amount
to Krishnamurthi (Son of Appaji)

62/1059
(E/1 & 2 files)

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 11th December 1900

3608 (A)

49

To

The Conservator of Forests
in Mysore.

SECTION Forest
FILE NO. 869/1897-98
SERIAL NO. 5

Sir

In forwarding herewith a copy of docket No. 10179 dated the H. F. 155-95
25th April 1898 from the Secretary to the Government of Mysore, General and Revenue Department, calling for a report to be submitted through you regarding certain lands of the Kandhalli village, Madabal Hobli of the Magadi Taluk, acquired for the Savandurga State Forest, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2- In 1862 a certain land bearing Survey No. 42 in the Kandhalli village, Magadi Taluk was granted to one Narasingappa, as Inam for planting a tope in

N.D. 15/12/00
Rec'd Dy. Secy.
Subd with refce
Secy 27/12/00 & Sl. 14 (14)
manager
Plan not sent
& submit to
Govt. As the
Compensation
Case is finished
nine remains to
be done D.C.
28/12/00.
Subd with
a note
30/12/00

Turvey No. 13, a Kandayan land
of his in the Kadikilie village
of the same Dakak. In the usual
course of things would, as per
Circular 15 of the 28th July 1846,
the advancement on the land on
which the tofa was situated, might
to have been written off of the
accounts and the land treated
as khalsa. But this was not done,
and the land which formed
the site of the tofa continued
to be treated as Kandayan land,
and the advancement on it
recovered. The plaintiff of the
[illegible]
for the [illegible] of the land
from his title disputed, because
he was carrying the tofa, as his
private property, and taking the
produce, and did not attempt to
exercise any rights of ownership
or [illegible]

of the patta, above spoken of. The non-transfer of the patta is urged by Krishnappa in proof of his statement, that Venkatramania, the purchaser in the auction sale, purchased the land on his (Krishnappa's) behalf. He also adds, in proof of the above statement, that the payment of the purchase money was entered in the village accounts, as having been made by Venkatramanaich for Krishnappa. But except this scanty evidence, which might have been due to the mistake of the Ranbopae, Krishnappa has no positive evidence to show his enjoyment of the land, in question, after the sale above referred to. One or two witnesses whom he has cited to prove his enjoyment, state that they leased the lands

[illegible] time during certain years,
and that he had certain [illegible]
stock. Inasmuch as
Kirkpatrick was, at that time,
acting as the agent of Moffitt
the fact that he (Kirkpatrick)
executed the lease and collected
the rent, is not incompatible with
Moffitt's ownership of the land.
And inasmuch as the lease Kirk-
patrick executed expired
the land reverted to Moffitt.
or to claiming under him.

R. S. 886 an account of arrears
of land revenue due from
Kirkpatrick, certain lands of his
were sold by auction. [illegible]
was [illegible] No 9 of [illegible]
the sale [illegible]
Deed [illegible]

by the then Sub Division Officer of Closepet, Mr. Abdul Rahiman, in his order No. 1029 dated the 25th February 1886.

5. In 1892, the Inam land Survey No. 42 of the Kandhalli Madenahalli village, referred to in para 3 above, was taken up by the Forest Department for the Savandrug State Forest. The Inam land taken up being a Dharmadaya Inam land and unenfranchised, it was sought to give in exchange for it an equal extent of land for the due accomplishment of the purpose of the Inam, i.e, the maintenance of a tope. But no suitable land being obtainable, it was decided to take over the tope to Government and to pay a compensation of Rs 500/-,

[illegible] for the Panama [illegible] Although delicacy, the Standard attempt at this arrangement was planned and the Panama land was taken over by the Department.

In all this negotiation, however, nothing is to be found giving Panama [illegible] Panama Canal for the maintenance of order. It seems to have been tacitly assumed by the American Division officers and the Deputy Commissioners, that law must be in existence after [illegible] which the United States [illegible] and no inquiry was made as to which [illegible] which was in force [illegible]

The other basis to the negotiation does not seem to have come to light [illegible]

as it was their interest not to do so. Thus, the fact that the tope for which the Inam had been granted, had been alienated so long ago as 1886 for arrears of revenue, and that it was not, at the time of the enquiry, in the possession of the Inamdar, quite escaped the notice of the officers who made the enquiry.

8. In the Government Proceedings, under reference, explanation is wanted as to why Rama, who had bought the tope in question in 1886, did not bring his title to the notice of the authorities at the time of the enquiry in 1896.

9. Rama in his statement, explains his omission on the ground that no one questioned him about

his right to the [illegible], and that
he never he said anything about it.

10. It may be that on account of
the [illegible] of the Swan Land
being in different names Mr Ana
the holder of the title, assignment
of the negotiations about the Swan
Land, or it may be it seems more
probable, that in order to [illegible]
a cause his bringing his title to
the [illegible] to the notice of the auth-
orities, would have been against the
interests of the Swan River Settlement
that he should be an influential man
of the place. However it [illegible],
this has not prevented
he [illegible] an agreement [illegible]
into with the [illegible] Land and
[illegible]
top [illegible]

11. An additional compensation of Rs 100/- was afterwards settled for some loss of crops. The payment of this compensation was sanctioned in Government order No. 4570-72 (10) Fk. 7155-95 dated the 19th November 1896, and the Government directed that the tope for which the Inam land had been granted, should be brought under Government management. In the enquiry that followed, the fact of the sale of the tope in 1886 was brought out.

Fk 7155-95 (10)

12. In April 1898, my predecessor, Mr. B. K. Venkatavaradiengar, directed that, as the conditions of the grant were violated, the Inam land reverted to Government from the date when the breach of the conditions came to be known, viz, 1886. Therefore, if the holder of the land, viz, Krishnamurti,

that you will be good enough to forward this report to Government, with your opinion, for the orders of Government.

16 - The vernacular file is sent herewith.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

C. Rajashekhar Deshmukh
for Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

2d/ris orders 33

(18)

Read

SECTION Forest
FILE No. 86 of 1897-98
SERIAL No. 6

Correspondence ending with letter No. 1059 dated the 14th December 1900. from the Deputy Commr. Bangalore District to the Conservator of Forests in Mysore, reporting on the inam land of Kandathalli in the Magady taluk which was taken up for the Savendurga State Forest

Letter No. 2541/49 dated 1st February 1901. from the Conservator of Forests submitting records relating to the above subject.

Order thereon.

Before passing final orders on this case,

Government

✓

No. 641 dt 11-4-01
No. FF. 155-95 Evd. V.P.

~~would~~ like to know who
is responsible ~~for~~
(1) for not reporting the
real facts of the case to
the Inspector General of
Forests and Lands etc
in the first instance:
(2) for accepting a bribe of
from the Jadiliers in respect
of the tape which had long
previously ceased to be
her property, and for
making on the strength
of the report No 7465 dated
the 11th October 1896 which
led both the Conservator
and the Government
to believe that for the R.P. Boom
in question Govt was
buying both the jade boom
and the tape from their
rightful owners, when as
a matter of fact the
Jadiliers had no saleable
interest in the tape ||:

(3) for paying the full amount of Compensation to the Jodidar in June 1898, when the question of his ~~title~~ title to the tope and the bonfides of his Mutchalika were under correspondence, and when, in short, Govt had, in calling for a further report about two months previously, enquired whether any and what portion of the Compensation had been paid and to whom, and (4) for the long delay of 2 years and 8 months in making the Dy. Commr's report dated 14th December 1900. Complete information as to the several officers concerned should be furnished together with

(responsibility of the)

Circular No.

[illegible]
respectively are invited to make
Compensation for a Judicial
village Council for the
upkeep of a tope which
the land contributed, subsequently
ordered to pay out of the
Treasury by a defaulter in the
payment of Kandayam. [illegible]
[illegible] once the money paid
to him without [illegible]
investigation and before
the passing of final orders
by Government once that
[illegible] keep about the
retirement of the same.

Sd/-

Secy. Board of Revenue

To

The Dy. Commrs
Bangalore Dist
Kannada, Vernacular Copies
[illegible]

87

1902/03

FOREST DEPARTMENT
No. 283/1941
MAY 25 1903
DEWAN'S OFFICE

From

The Dy Commr Bangalore District

To

The offg Secy to the Govt of Mysore Forest Deptt

Dated 23rd May 1903

Despatched 25th May 1903

Received 25/5/03

General No.

D No. 1305

Enclosure No. One Statement & a file

SECTION Forest

FILE No. 86 9 1897-98

SER'AL No. 7

Govt Pro: No 641 of 11th April 1903.

Secretariat branch initials short note for 25/5/03

Note Contd Hd 8/6/03

Subject of the

Submits report on the Settlement of compensation for the Soli lands of Kamsahalli in the Magadi Taluk taken up for the Savandrug State Forest.

MGCPB—50 reams—6-12-02.

Bangalore District
Dy Commissioners office
Bangalore 23rd May 93

From,

H. St. S Parker Esq
Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To,

M. Muthannah Esq B. B.
Offg Secy to the Govt of Mysore
Forest Deptt

Sir,

With reference to
Government Proceedings No 641 dated
H 155-95
11th April last with the Forest Department,
calling for an account of the responsibility
of different Officers who settled the
compensation for the Sooli lands

of

of Kandahalli in the Magadi Taluk,
taken up for the Savandurg State Forest,
I have the honour to submit as follows:—

2. Mr Srinivachar was the Amildar
of the Taluk in 1896 and it was he who
took a muchilika from the heir of the
person who had purchased the tope
after it had lost its character as
private inam tope ie from Karnik Krishna
Murti Rao on the 26th August 1896 and
made his report No 128 dated the 16th October
1896 to the then Sub Division Officer of
Closepet Mr K.P. Puttanna Chetty.

3. Report No 745 dated the 11th October
1896, to the Conservator of Forests was
based by the then Dy Commissioner Mr V. N.

Narasimma Iyengar on the above
Correspondence. The initial mistake, it
will thus be seen originated in the Taluk
and subsequently relied on by the Sub-
Division office and the Dy Commissioner

4. The amount of Compensation was paid
to the party under the orders of the then
Dy Commissioner, Mr B. N. Venkatarangaiya
Iyengar recorded on the office memo
dated 6th April 1898.

5 The above officer who transacted
the business of settlement and payment
of Compensation as above described
are not now in this District and Mr
Govindachar has now retired from
Service

6. Kavuri Krishna Murthi Rao who
was

was served with a notice to shew cause why he should not be made to refund the compensation amount paid to him, has given a reply that he can furnish no further reasons than those already contained in the file and that the compensation amount paid to him was for whatever title he possessed in the land. He merely asserts his rights and protests against the reopening of the question. Out of the Compensation paid to him, has been withheld the amount of Kandayan due on account of previous arrears on this land. His Statement is herein enclosed.

4. The open file received with the

the Government Proceedings under reference is herewith, resubmitted.

I have the honor to be.

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

H. C. Sperling

By Commissioner

Lima

45

reopening of the question at this distant date, on the ground that it was paid to him for whatever interest he had in the lands in question. The Sub Division officer and the Deputy Tahsildar above referred to are not now in the District, while the Amildar has since retired.

2. The several officers above named do not seem to have gone into the case as carefully as they ought to have done, the consequence being that payment of a sum of Rs 600/- was made to a person who had no title to it. Owing, however, to the long time that has elapsed since the transaction referred to took place, no further action in the matter seems called for.

Mg: Secretary.

To,

The Deputy Commr, Bangalore District, returning the records.

A. 4/4/03.

& of the several officers concerned in the settlement
& of Compensation for the jodi lands of Kandahalli
includes in the Savendrug State Forest and the
payment there of without a proper inquiry as
to the title of the claimant, and directed that
the Jodidar may be called upon to explain why
he should not refund the Compensation so
paid to him through his representation. In
~~response~~ reply, the present Dy Conr of the Bangalore
Dist reports that the initial mistake in
the case was made by the then Amildar,
Mr Srinivachar, and that the recommendation
for the payment of the Compensation made by
the then Sub Division officer of Closepet Mr.
K. P. Puttannachetty and the Dy Conr Mr.
V. R. Narasimhaiengar was based entirely on
his report; that the Compensation was subse-
-quently paid to the Jodidar under the orders
of Mr. B. K. Venkatavaradaiengar, Dy Conr;
and that the Jodidar declines to refund the
Compensation and protests against the ( )

reopening